arXiv:1601.06338v1 [quant-ph] 24 Jan 2016

UNCERTAINTY RELATIONS FOR ANY MULTI OBSERVABLES

JINCHUAN HOU, KAN HE

Abstract. Uncertainty relations describe the lower bound of product of standard deviations of observables. By revealing a connection between standard deviations of quantum observables and numerical radius of operators, we establish a universal uncertainty relation for any k observables, of which the formulation depends on the even or odd quality of k. This universal uncertainty relation is tight at least for the cases $k = 2n$ and $k = 3$. For two observables, the uncertainty relation is exactly a simpler reformulation of Schrödinger's uncertainty principle.

1. Introduction

In the past ninety years, the theory of quantum mechanics was applied in lots of other sciences, including Information Science, Chemistry and Biology (Ref. [2, 3, 9]). The uncertainty principle, discovered first by Heisenberg in 1927 (Ref. [7]), is often considered as one of the most important topics of quantum theory (Ref. [8, 13]) and can be linked to quantum entanglement and other important topics (Ref. [1, 10]). Heisenberg's uncertainty principle says that

$$\Delta_q \Delta_p \geq \frac{\hbar}{2}, \tag{1.1}$$

where Δ_q and Δ_p denote standard deviations of the position $\hat{q}$ and momentum $\hat{p}$ respectively, $\hbar = \frac{1}{2}|\langle \hat{q}\hat{p} - \hat{p}\hat{q}\rangle|$ is the reduced Planck constant. Recalled that a quantum system can be simulated in a complex Hilbert space H with the inner product $\langle\cdot|\cdot\rangle$ and a pure state is described by a unit vector $|x\rangle$. Quantum observables for a state $|x\rangle$ are self-adjoint operators on H with domain containing $|x\rangle$ (Ref. [13]). The value of observable A for the pure state $|x\rangle$ is $\langle A\rangle = \langle x|A|x\rangle$. In 1929, Robertson generalized Heisenberg's uncertainty principle, which says that, for observables A, B and pure state $|x\rangle$,

$$\Delta_A \Delta_B \geq \frac{1}{2}|\langle [A, B]\rangle|. \tag{1.2}$$

PACS 2010. 03.65.Ta, 03.65.Db, 02.30.Tb.

Key words and phrases. quantum states, uncertainty principle, observables, deviations.

Where $[A,B]=AB-BA$ is the Lie product of A and B,

$$\Delta_A=\sqrt{\langle A^2\rangle-\langle A\rangle^2} \text{ and } \Delta_B=\sqrt{\langle B^2\rangle-\langle B\rangle^2}$$

are the standard deviations of A and B, respectively [11]. Schrödinger gave a uncertainty principle, which is sharper than Robertson's and asserts that

$$\Delta_A\Delta_B\geq\sqrt{\frac{1}{4}|\langle[A,B]\rangle|^2+|\frac{1}{2}\langle\{A,B\}\rangle-\langle A\rangle\langle B\rangle|^2}, \tag{1.3}$$

where $\{A,B\}=AB+BA$ is the Jordan product of A and B [12]. Schrödinger's uncertainty principle holds for mixed state, too. Recall that a mixed state ρ is a positive operator on H with trace 1. Then the value of observable A for the state ρ is $\langle A\rangle=\mathrm{Tr}(A\rho)$ and the standard deviation of A is $\Delta_A=\sqrt{\langle A^2\rangle-\langle A\rangle^2}=\sqrt{\mathrm{Tr}(A^2\rho)-\mathrm{Tr}(A\rho)^2}$. Here we assume that both $\mathrm{Tr}(A\rho)$ and $\mathrm{Tr}(A^2\rho)$ are finite.

What happens for multi observables?

There is a simple way to get certain uncertainty relation from the uncertainty principles in (1.2) or (1.3). For example, let A,B,C be three observables, then by applying (2) one gets

$$\Delta_A^2\Delta_B^2\Delta_C^2\geq\frac{1}{8}|\langle[A,B]\rangle\langle[B,C]\rangle\langle[A,C]\rangle|. \tag{1.4}$$

But (1.4) is not sharp enough.

Let $A=\hat{q},B=\hat{p}$ and $C=\hat{r}=-\hat{p}-\hat{q}$; then $[p,q]=[q,r]=[r,p]=\frac{\hbar}{i}$, and thus (1.4), together with (1.1), gives

$$\Delta_q^2\Delta_p^2\Delta_r^2\geq(\frac{\hbar}{2})^3.$$

However, in [15], a tight uncertainty relation is given that

$$\Delta_q^2\Delta_p^2\Delta_r^2\geq(\tau\frac{\hbar}{2})^3 \tag{1.5}$$

with $\tau=\frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}>1$.

This also happens for Pauli matrices X,Y,Z. As $[X,Y]=2iZ$, one has $\frac{1}{2}|\langle[X,Y]\rangle|=|\langle Z\rangle|$. Similarly $\frac{1}{2}|\langle[X,Z]\rangle|=|\langle Y\rangle|$ and $\frac{1}{2}|\langle[Y,Z]\rangle|=|\langle X\rangle|$. Thus by (1.4)

$$\Delta_X^2\Delta_Y^2\Delta_Z^2\geq|\langle X\rangle\langle Y\rangle\langle Z\rangle|.$$

But it was announced by S.-M. Fei that

$$\Delta_X^2\Delta_Y^2\Delta_Z^2\geq\frac{8}{3\sqrt{3}}|\langle X\rangle\langle Y\rangle\langle Z\rangle|. \tag{1.6}$$

This inequality is also tight and achieves "=" at $\rho=\frac{1}{2}(I+\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}X+\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}Y+\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}Z)$.

Therefore, to obtain uncertainty relations for multi observables that are sharp enough, one needs new approaches. Let $A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_k$ be any k observerbles of a quantum system. The purpose of this paper is to establish a lower bound of $\Delta_{A_1}\Delta_{A_2}\cdots\Delta_{A_k}$ in terms of $\langle A_iA_j\rangle$, $\langle A_i\rangle\langle A_j\rangle$ and $\langle A_j^2\rangle$. For the case when $k = 2$, the uncertainty relation is equivalent to Schrödinger's uncertainty principle that is tight and has a simpler representation. For the case when $k = 3$, we show that the untainty relation is tight by taking Pauli matrices as observables. All proofs of the main result and the lemmas will be presented in the appendix section.

2. UNCERTAINTY RELATIONS FOR MULTI OBSERVABLES

Our main idea is based on the following observation, which establishes a formula to connect the standard deviation of a quantum observable A of a state $|x\rangle$ to the norm as well as the numerical radius of $[A, |x\rangle\langle x|]$, the Lie product of A and the rank one projection $|x\rangle\langle x|$.

Let T be a bounded linear operator acting on a complex Hilbert space H. The numerical range of T is the set $W(T) = \{\langle x|T|x\rangle \ : \ |x\rangle \in H, \||x\rangle\| = 1\}$, and the numerical radius of T is $w(T) = \sup\{|\lambda| \ : \ \lambda \in W(T)\}$. The topic of numerical range and numerical radius plays an important role in mathematics and is applied into many areas (Ref. [4, 5, 6]). Denote by $\|T\|$ the operator norm of T.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $|x\rangle$ be a pure state and A an observable for it. Then*

$$\Delta_A = \|[A, |x\rangle\langle x|]\| = w([A, |x\rangle\langle x|]).$$

By Lemma 2.1, for any observables $A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_k$ for a pure state $|x\rangle$,

$$\Pi_{j=1}^k\Delta_{A_j} = \Pi_{j=1}^k\|[A_j, |x\rangle\langle x|]\| \geq \|\Pi_{j=1}^k[A_j, |x\rangle\langle x|]\| \geq w(\Pi_{j=1}^k[A_j, |x\rangle\langle x|]). \tag{2.1}$$

Note that, the value of $\Pi_{j=1}^k\Delta_{A_j}$ does not depend on the order arrange of observables but $w(\Pi_{j=1}^k[A_j, |x\rangle\langle x|])$ does. Therefore, the inequality (2.1) can be sharped to

$$\Pi_{j=1}^k\Delta_{A_j} \geq \max_{\pi} w(\Pi_{j=1}^k[A_{\pi(j)}, |x\rangle\langle x|]), \tag{2.2}$$

where the maximum is over all permutations π of $(1, 2, \ldots, k)$. Thus the question of establishing an uncertainty relation for k observales is reduced to the question of

calculating the numerical radius of the operator

$$D_k^{(\pi)} = \Pi_{j=1}^k [A_{\pi(j)}, |x\rangle\langle x|], \tag{2.3}$$

which is an operator of rank ≤ 2.

The exact value of $w(D_k^{(\pi)})$ is computable and we can establish an uncertainty relation for any multi observables by (2.2). For simplicity, and with no loss of generality, we state our results only for $\pi = \mathrm{id}$.

One may ask why do not work on the stronger inequality

$$\Pi_{j=1}^k \Delta_{A_j} \geq \|\Pi_{j=1}^k [A_j, |x\rangle\langle x|]\|?$$

In fact, as we show in the Appendix section, this stronger inequality leads to weaker uncertainty relations. So the numerical radius is the better choice.

The following is our main result, here we agree on $\Pi_{j\in\Lambda} a_j = 1$ if $\Lambda = \emptyset$. It is surprising that our uncertainty relation for any k observables has different formulation depending on the even or odd quality of the integer k.

Theorem 2.2. *Let $A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_k$ with $k \geq 2$ be observables.*

(1) *If $k = 2n$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pi_{j=1}^{2n} \Delta_{A_j} \\ \geq\ & \tfrac{1}{2}(\Pi_{j=1}^{n-1} |\langle A_{2j} A_{2j+1}\rangle - \langle A_{2j}\rangle\langle A_{2j+1}\rangle|)(|\langle A_1 A_{2n}\rangle - \langle A_1\rangle\langle A_{2n}\rangle| + \Delta_{A_1}\Delta_{A_{2n}}). \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

(2) *If $k = 2n+1$, then, identifying $2n+2$ with $[(2n+2) \bmod (2n+1)] = 1$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pi_{j=1}^{2n+1} \Delta_{A_j} \\ \geq\ & \tfrac{1}{2}[2\Pi_{j=1}^{2n+1} |\langle A_j A_{j+1}\rangle - \langle A_j\rangle\langle A_{j+1}\rangle| \\ & + \Delta_{A_1}^2 \Pi_{j=1}^n |\langle A_{2j} A_{2j+1}\rangle - \langle A_{2j}\rangle\langle A_{2j+1}\rangle|^2 \\ & + \Delta_{A_{2n+1}}^2 \Pi_{j=1}^n |\langle A_{2j-1} A_{2j}\rangle - \langle A_{2j-1}\rangle\langle A_{2j}\rangle|^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

Obviously, "=" holds if and only if

$$\Pi_{j=1}^k \|[A_j, |x\rangle\langle x|]\| = \|\Pi_{j=1}^k [A_j, |x\rangle\langle x|]\| = w(\Pi_{j=1}^k [A_j, |x\rangle\langle x|]). \tag{2.6}$$

Thus the uncertainty relation is tight if Eq.(2.6) holds for some observerbles $A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_k$ and some state. This is the case as will be illustrated in Section 4.

We remak that Theorem 2.2 holds for any state ρ with $|\mathrm{Tr}(A_j\rho)| < \infty$ and $\mathrm{Tr}(A_j^2\rho) < \infty$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, k$. To see this, denote by $\mathcal{C}_2(H)$ be the Hilbert-Schimit class in H, which

is a Hilbert space with inner product $\langle T, S\rangle = \mathrm{Tr}(T^\dagger S)$. Then, a positive operator ρ is a state if and only if $\sqrt{\rho}$ is a unit vector in $\mathcal{C}_2(H)$. For a self-adjoint operator A on H, define a linear operator L_A on $\mathcal{C}_2(H)$ by $L_A T = AT$ if $\mathrm{Tr}(T^\dagger A^2 T) < \infty$. It is clear that L_A is self-adjoint as $L_A^\dagger = L_{A^\dagger} = L_A$. Note that

$$\langle A\rangle = \mathrm{Tr}(A\rho) = \langle\sqrt{\rho}|L_A|\sqrt{\rho}\rangle = \langle L_A\rangle$$

and thus

$$\Delta_A = \Delta_{L_A}, \quad \langle L_A L_B\rangle = \langle L_{AB}\rangle = \langle AB\rangle.$$

Then, Theorem 2.2 is true by applying (2.1) to $L_{A_1}, L_{A_2}, \ldots, L_{A_k}$ and the pure state $|\sqrt{\rho}\rangle$.

Before to see the uncertainty relations presented by theorem 2.2 is sharper than those obtained by Heisenberg's uncertainty principle (1.2) and Schrödinger's uncertainty principle (1.3), we illustrate some application of Theorem 2.2 for the cases $k = 2$.

3. The case of $k = 2$: a reformulation of Schrödinger's principle

Applying Theorem 2.2 (1) to the case when $k = 2$, the following result is immediate.

Theorem 3.1. *Let A and B be observables for a state. Then*

$$\Delta_A \Delta_B \geq |\langle AB\rangle - \langle A\rangle\langle B\rangle|, \tag{3.1}$$

which is equivalent to Schrödinger's uncertainty principle.

The expression of inequality is quite simpler than that of Schrödinger's uncertainty principle. We show that (3.1) is in fact equivalent to Schrödinger's uncertainty principle (1.3).

To check it, write $\langle A\rangle\langle B\rangle = r$ and $\langle AB\rangle = s + it$, where $s, t, r \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $\langle BA\rangle = s - it$. A simple computation gives

$$|\langle AB\rangle - \langle A\rangle\langle B\rangle| = \sqrt{(s-r)^2 + t^2},$$

$$\sqrt{\frac{1}{4}|\langle [A,B]\rangle|^2 + |\frac{1}{2}\langle \{A,B\}\rangle - \langle A\rangle\langle B\rangle|^2} = \sqrt{(s-r)^2 + t^2}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2}|\langle [A,B]\rangle| = |t|.$$

So, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_A\Delta_B &\geq |\langle A\rangle\langle B\rangle - \langle AB\rangle| \\ &= \sqrt{\tfrac{1}{4}|\langle [A,B]\rangle|^2 + |\tfrac{1}{2}\langle\{A,B\}\rangle - \langle A\rangle\langle B\rangle|^2} \\ &\geq \tfrac{1}{2}|\langle [A,B]\rangle|.\end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

Now we are at a position to show that Theorem 2.2 is sharper than the uncertainty relations obtained by the approach mentioned in the introduction section.

Let $A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_k$ be observables.

If $k = 2n$ is even, by inequalities (3.2) one has

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi_{j=1}^{k}\Delta_{A_j} &= (\Pi_{j=1}^{n-1}(\Delta_{A_{2j}}\Delta_{A_{2j+1}}))(\Delta_{A_1}\Delta_{A_{2n}}) \\ &\geq (\Pi_{j=1}^{n-1}|\langle A_{2j}A_{2j+1}\rangle - \langle A_{2j}\rangle\langle A_{2j+1}\rangle|)\langle A_1A_{2n}\rangle - \langle A_1\rangle\langle A_{2n}\rangle| \\ &\geq \tfrac{1}{2^n}(\Pi_{j=1}^{n-1}|\langle [A_{2j}, A_{2j+1}]\rangle|)|\langle [A_1, A_{2n}]\rangle|,\end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

which is weaker than the inequality (2.4) since $\Delta_{A_1}\Delta_{A_{2n}} \geq |\langle A_1A_{2n}\rangle - \langle A_1\rangle\langle A_{2n}\rangle|$.

If $k = 2n+1$ is odd, by (3.2) again we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi_{j=1}^{k}\Delta_{A_j}^2 &= (\Pi_{j=1}^{n}(\Delta_{A_{2j-1}}\Delta_{A_{2j}}))(\Pi_{j=1}^{n}(\Delta_{A_{2j}}\Delta_{A_{2j+1}}))(\Delta_{A_1}\Delta_{A_{2n+1}}) \\ &\geq (\Pi_{j=1}^{n}|(\langle A_{2j-1}A_{2j}\rangle - \langle A_{2j-1}\rangle\langle A_{2j}\rangle)(\langle A_{2j}A_{2j+1}\rangle - \langle A_{2j}\rangle\langle A_{2j+1}\rangle)|)\cdot \\ &\quad \cdot|\langle A_1A_{2n+1}\rangle - \langle A_1\rangle\langle A_{2n+1}\rangle| \\ &\geq \tfrac{1}{2^{2(2n+1)}}(\Pi_{j=1}^{n}(|\langle [A_{2j-1}, A_{2j}]\rangle\langle [A_{2j}, A_{2j+1}]\rangle|))|\langle [A_1, A_{2n+1}]\rangle|,\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

which is clearly weaker than the inequality (2.5) as $a^2 + b^2 \geq 2ab$ and $\Delta_{A_1}\Delta_{A_{2n+1}} \geq |\langle A_1A_{2n+1}\rangle - \langle A_1\rangle\langle A_{2n+1}\rangle|$.

4. Uncertainty relations for three or four observables

By Theorem 2.2 and a careful check of its proof, one gets a uncertainty relation for any three observables like the following.

Theorem 4.1. *Let A, B, C be three observables for a state ρ in a state space H, then*

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_A^2\Delta_B^2\Delta_C^2 \geq\ & \tfrac{1}{4}(\Delta_C^2|\langle AB\rangle - \langle A\rangle\langle B\rangle|^2 + \Delta_A^2|\langle BC\rangle - \langle B\rangle\langle C\rangle|^2) \\ & + \tfrac{1}{2}|(\langle AB\rangle - \langle A\rangle\langle B\rangle)(\langle BC\rangle - \langle B\rangle\langle C\rangle)(\langle AC\rangle - \langle A\rangle\langle C\rangle)|.\end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

Particularly, for the case when $\Delta_A\Delta_C = |\langle AC\rangle - \langle A\rangle\langle C\rangle|$ or $\langle AB\rangle = \langle A\rangle\langle B\rangle$ or $\dim H = 2$*,*

$$\Delta_A\Delta_B\Delta_C \geq \frac{1}{2}(\Delta_A|\langle BC\rangle - \langle B\rangle\langle C\rangle| + \Delta_C|\langle AB\rangle - \langle A\rangle\langle B\rangle|). \tag{4.2}$$

The inequalities (4.1) and (4.2) are tight as illustrated by applying to Pauli matrices.

Example 4.2. Uncertainty relations for Pauli matrices.

Let X, Y, Z be Pauli matrices, that is,

$$X = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad Y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad Z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Recall that, for any dense matrix $\rho \in M_2(\mathbb{C})$, ρ has a representation

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2}(I_2 + r_1 X + r_2 Y + r_3 Z)$$

with Bloch vector $(r_1, r_2, r_3)^t \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $r_1^2 + r_2^2 + r_3^2 \leq 1$; and ρ is pure if and only if $r_1^2 + r_2^2 + r_3^2 = 1$. Recall also that $XY = iZ$, $YZ = iX$ and $\Delta_A^2 = 1 - \langle A \rangle^2$ for $A \in \{X, Y, Z\}$, $\langle X^2 \rangle = \langle Y^2 \rangle = \langle Z^2 \rangle = 1$ and $(\langle X \rangle, \langle Y \rangle, \langle Z \rangle) = (r_1, r_2, r_3)$.

Applying the inequality (4.2) of Theorem 4.1 to X, Y, Z we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta_X \Delta_Y \Delta_Z \\ \geq\ & \tfrac{1}{2}(\Delta_X |i\langle X \rangle - \langle Y \rangle \langle Z \rangle| + \Delta_Z |i\langle Z \rangle - \langle X \rangle \langle Y \rangle|) \\ =\ & \tfrac{1}{2}(\sqrt{(1 - \langle X \rangle^2)(\langle X \rangle^2 + \langle Y \rangle^2 \langle Z \rangle^2)} + \sqrt{(1 - \langle Z \rangle^2)(\langle Z \rangle^2 + \langle X \rangle^2 \langle Y \rangle^2)}\ ). \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

Obviously, the inequality (4.3) is tight and "=" holds if the Bloch vector satisfies $|r_1| = |r_3| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ and $r_2 = 0$.

This illustrates that Theorem 2.2 is tight for three observables. Since Schrödinger's uncertainty principle (1.3) is tight and our uncertainty relation is equivalent to Schrödinger's uncertainty principle by (3.2), Theorem 2.2 is also tight for two obserables.

Moreover, by Theorem 3.1,

$$(1 - \langle Z \rangle^2)(1 - \langle X \rangle^2) \geq \langle Y \rangle^2 + \langle X \rangle^2 \langle Z \rangle^2,$$

hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta_X^2 \Delta_Y^2 \Delta_Z^2 \\ \geq\ & \tfrac{1}{4}[(1 - \langle X \rangle^2)(\langle X \rangle^2 + \langle Y \rangle^2 \langle Z \rangle^2) + (1 - \langle Z \rangle^2)(\langle Z \rangle^2 + \langle X \rangle^2 \langle Y \rangle^2)] \\ & + \tfrac{1}{2}\sqrt{(1 - \langle Z \rangle^2)(1 - \langle X \rangle^2)(\langle X \rangle^2 + \langle Y \rangle^2 \langle Z \rangle^2)(\langle Z \rangle^2 + \langle X \rangle^2 \langle Y \rangle^2)} \\ \geq\ & \tfrac{1}{4}[(1 - \langle X \rangle^2)(\langle X \rangle^2 + \langle Y \rangle^2 \langle Z \rangle^2) + (1 - \langle Z \rangle^2)(\langle Z \rangle^2 + \langle X \rangle^2 \langle Y \rangle^2)] \\ & + \tfrac{1}{2}\sqrt{(\langle Y \rangle^2 + \langle X \rangle^2 \langle Z \rangle^2)(\langle X \rangle^2 + \langle Y \rangle^2 \langle Z \rangle^2)(\langle Z \rangle^2 + \langle X \rangle^2 \langle Y \rangle^2)} \\ \geq\ & \sqrt{(\langle Y \rangle^2 + \langle X \rangle^2 \langle Z \rangle^2)(\langle X \rangle^2 + \langle Y \rangle^2 \langle Z \rangle^2)(\langle Z \rangle^2 + \langle X \rangle^2 \langle Y \rangle^2)} \\ \geq\ & 2\sqrt{2} |\langle X \rangle \langle Y \rangle \langle Z \rangle|^{\frac{3}{2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

Particularly, one has

$$\Delta_X^2\Delta_Y^2\Delta_Z^2 \geq 2\sqrt{2}|\langle X\rangle\langle Y\rangle\langle Z\rangle|^{\frac{3}{2}}. \tag{4.5}$$

Observe that we always have

$$1 \geq \Delta_X^2\Delta_Y^2\Delta_Z^2 = (1-r_1^2)(1-r_2^2)(1-r_3^2) \geq \frac{8}{27}$$

since the function $(1-r_1^2)(1-r_2^2)(1-r_3^2)$ has its minimum value $\frac{8}{27}$ at $|r_1| = |r_2| = |r_3| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}$ and the maximum value 1 at $\rho = \frac{1}{2}I_2$. Moreover, $|r_1r_2r_3|$ achieves simultaneously its maximum value $\frac{1}{3\sqrt{3}}$ at $|r_1| = |r_2| = |r_3| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}$. Thus the inequality (4.5) can be sharped to

$$\Delta_X^2\Delta_Y^2\Delta_Z^2 \geq \frac{8\sqrt[4]{3}}{3}|\langle X\rangle\langle Y\rangle\langle Z\rangle|^{\frac{3}{2}}. \tag{4.6}$$

The inequality (4.6) is tight in the sense that "=" holds if $|r_1| = |r_2| = r_3| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}$.

Compare (4.3) with (1.6) and (4.6). Although these inequalities are all tight, one of the remarkable advantage of (4.3) is that, even if some of $\langle X\rangle, \langle Y\rangle, \langle Z\rangle$ are zero, we still may get a positive lower bound of $\Delta_X\Delta_Y\Delta_Z$. For instance, saying $\langle Y\rangle = 0$, we have

$$\Delta_X\Delta_Y\Delta_Z \geq \frac{1}{2}\left(\sqrt{(1-\langle X\rangle^2)\langle X\rangle^2} + \sqrt{(1-\langle Z\rangle^2)\langle Z\rangle^2}\right);$$

saying $\langle Y\rangle = \langle Z\rangle = 0$, we have

$$\Delta_X\Delta_Y\Delta_Z \geq \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{(1-\langle X\rangle^2)\langle X\rangle^2},$$

while we cannot get any information from (1.6) and (4.6).

Before conclusion we state the uncertainty relation from Theorem 2.2 for four observations, which has a relatively simple expression.

Theorem 4.3. *Let A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4 be observables. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta_{A_1}\Delta_{A_2}\Delta_{A_3}\Delta_{A_4} \\ \geq\ & \tfrac{1}{2}|\langle A_2A_3\rangle - \langle A_2\rangle\langle A_3\rangle|(|\langle A_1A_4\rangle - \langle A_1\rangle\langle A_4\rangle| + \Delta_{A_1}\Delta_{A_4}). \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

The inequality (4.7) is tight. For example, Consider bipartite continuous-variable system. Let $(A_1, A_4, A_2, A_3) = (\hat{q}_1, \hat{p}_1, \hat{q}_2, \hat{p}_2)$, where $\hat{q}_i, \hat{p}_i$ are the position and momentum in the ith mode satisfying the canonical commutation relation. As Heisenberg's

uncertainty principle (1.1) is tight, we say that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta_{q_1}\Delta_{p_1}\Delta_{q_2}\Delta_{p_2} \\ \geq\ & \tfrac{1}{2}|\langle\hat{q}_2\hat{p}_2\rangle - \langle\hat{q}_2\rangle\langle\hat{p}_2\rangle|(|\langle\hat{q}_1\hat{p}_1\rangle - \langle\hat{q}_1\rangle\langle\hat{p}_1\rangle| + \Delta_{q_1}\Delta_{p_4}). \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

is tight, the "=" is attained at $\rho = e$.

Similarly, considering the positions and momentums $(\hat{q}_1, \hat{p}_1, \hat{q}_2, \hat{p}_2, \ldots, \hat{q}_n, \hat{p}_n)$ in a n-partite continuous-variable system, one sees that the uncertainty relation (2.4) in Theorem 2.2 is tight.

However we do not know whether the uncertainty relation (2.5) is tight for odd $k = 2n + 1 \geq 5$.

5. Conclusion

Uncertainty relations discover lower bounds of the product of standard deviations of several observables. Larger the lower bound is, more powerful the corresponding uncertainty relation is. There are no known uncertainty relations that valid for arbitrary multi observavles. By finding the equality of deviation and the norm of the Lie product of the observable and the pure state, we reduce the question of establishing uncertainty relation of multi observerbles to the question of computing the numerical radius of an operator of rank ≤ 2. This enable us establish a universal uncertainty relation for any k observables, of which, the formulation depends on the even or odd quality of k. For two observables, our uncertainty relation is exactly a simpler reformulation of Schrödinger's uncertainty principle. The uncertainty relation provided in this paper is tight, at least for the cases of two and three observables, as illustrated by examples.

References

[1] M. Berta, M. Christandl, R. Colbeck, J. M. Renes, R. Renner, The uncertainty principle in the presence of quantum memory, Nature Physics 6, 659-662 (2010) doi:10.1038/nphys1734

[2] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, Quantum information and computation, Nature 404, 247-255 (2000) doi:10.1038/35005001

[3] G. S. Engel, T. R. Calhoun, E. L. Read, T. K. Ahn, T. Mancal, et al., Evidence for wavelike energy transfer through quantum coherence in photosynthetic systems, Nature 446, 782 (2007).

[4] K. E. Gustafson, D. K. M. Rao, Numerical Range, Springer-Verlag, New York, Inc., 1997.

[5] P. R. Halmos, A Hilbert space problem book, Springer-Verlag, 1982.

[6] K. He, J.-C. Hou, X.-L. Zhang, Maps preserving numerical radius or cross norms of products of self-adjoint operators, Acta Mathematica Sinica-English Series 26 (2010), 1071-1086.

[7] W. Heisenberg, Über den anschaulichen Inhalt der quantentheoretischen Kinematik und Mechanik. Z. Phys. 43, 172-198 (1927).

[8] W. Heisenberg, The physical principles of quantum theory, (University of Chicago Press, 1930).

[9] B. P. Lanyon, J. D. Whitfield, G. G. Gillett, M. E. Goggin, M. P. Almeida, et al., Towards quantum chemistry on a quantum computer, Nature Chemistry, (2010) 2, 106-111 doi:10.1038/nchem.483

[10] R. Prevedel, D. R. Hamel, R. Colbeck, K. Fisher , K. J. Resch, Experimental investigation of the uncertainty principle in the presence of quantum memory and its application to witnessing entanglement, Nature Physics 7 757-761 (2011) doi:10.1038/nphys2048

[11] H. P. Robertson, The Uncertainty Principle, Phys. Rev. 34, 163-Published 1 July 1929

[12] E. Schrödinger, Zum Heisenbergschen Unschärfeprinzip. Berl. Ber. 296-303 (1930). [English translation: A. Angelow, M. C. Batoni, About Heisenberg uncertainty relation. Bulg. J. Phys. 26(5/6), 193-203 (1999). arXiv:quant-ph/9903100

[13] J. von Neumann, Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics, (Princeton University Press, 1932).

[14] D. S. Keeler, L. Rodman, I. M. Spitkovsky, The numrical range of 3×3 matrices, Linear Algebra Appl., 252 (1997), 115-139.

[15] S. Kechrimparis, S. Weigert, Heisenberg uncertainty relation for three canonical observables, Phys. Rev. A 90, 062118 (2014)

[16] L. Maccone, A. K. Pati, Stronger Uncertainty Relations for All Incompatible Observables, Phys. Rev. Lett. 113, 260401(2014)

6. Appendix

In the appendix, we give the proofs of theorems 2.1 and 2.2.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Let H be the associated Hilbert space for the pure state $|x\rangle$ and the observable A. Write $A|x\rangle$ in the form $A|x\rangle = \alpha|x\rangle + \beta|y\rangle$, where normalized $|y\rangle$ is orthogonal to $|x\rangle$. Since A is self-adjoint we have $\alpha = \langle x|A|x\rangle \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, by self-adjointness of A, the Lie product of A and the rank one projection $|x\rangle\langle x|$ is represented by the following matrix relative to decomposition $H = [x] \oplus [y] \oplus \{x, y, \}^{\perp}$, here $[x] = \text{span}\{x\}$. Then

$$[A, |x\rangle\langle x|] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\bar{\beta} \\ \beta & 0 \end{pmatrix} \oplus 0.$$

Note that $[A, |x\rangle\langle x|]$ is a skew self-adjoint operator because $[A, |x\rangle\langle x|]^\dagger = -[A, |x\rangle\langle x|]$. Thus its numerical range $W([A, |x\rangle\langle x|]) = i[-|\beta|, |\beta|]$, and hence $w([A, |x\rangle\langle x|]) = \|[A, x \otimes x]\| = |\beta|$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} w([A, |x\rangle\langle x|])^2 &= \|[A, |x\rangle\langle x|]\| = |\beta|^2 \\ &= \|A|x\rangle - \langle x|A|x\rangle\, |x\rangle\|^2 \\ &= \langle x|(A - \langle x|A|x\rangle)^2|x\rangle \\ &= \langle x|A^2|x\rangle - (\langle x|A|x\rangle)^2 \\ &= \langle A^2\rangle - \langle A\rangle^2 = \Delta_A^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\Delta_A = w([A, |x\rangle\langle x|]) = \|[A, |x\rangle\langle x|]\|$, completing the proof. □

Before start the proof of Theorem 2.2, we need a lemma.

Lemma A1. *Let*

$$E_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a & b \\ c & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, E_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a \\ c & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then

$$w(E_1) = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{|b|^2 + (|a| + |c|)^2}$$

and

$$w(E_2) = \frac{1}{2}(|a| + |c|).$$

Proof. Obviously, with $ac = |ac|e^{2i\theta}$, $\sigma(E_1) = \{\pm\sqrt{|ac|}e^{i\theta}, 0\}$. It is easily checked that E_1 satisfies the conditions of Theorem 2.3 and 2.4 of Ref [14], and hence the numerical range $W(E_1)$ of E_1 is an elliptic disc with foci $\{\pm\sqrt{|ac|}e^{i\theta}\}$. Thus the numerical radius $w(E_1)$ is the half length of major axis of the ellipse.

Let $F = e^{-i\theta}E_1$; then $w(F) = w(E_1)$. As $\sigma(F) = \{\pm\sqrt{|ac|}, 0\}$, we see that

$$w(F) = \|\mathrm{Re}(F)\|.$$

Note that

$$\sigma(\mathrm{Re}(F)) = \{0, \pm\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{|b|^2 + |ae^{-i\theta} + \bar{c}e^{i\theta}|^2}\ \}.$$

A simple computation shows that

$$|ae^{-i\theta} + \bar{c}e^{i\theta}|^2 = (|a| + |c|)^2.$$

Therefore, we have

$$w(E_1) = w(F) = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{|b|^2 + (|a| + |c|)^2}.$$

It is also easily checked that

$$w(E_2) = \frac{1}{2}|ae^{-i\theta} + \bar{c}e^{i\theta}| = \frac{1}{2}(|a| + |c|).$$

□

Proof of Theorem 2.2. As remarked after the statement os Theorem 2.2, it is enough to prove the theorem for the pure states.

For any given observables $A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_k$ with $k \geq 2$, let $D_k = \Pi_{j=1}^{k}[A_j, |x\rangle\langle x|]$, which has the form

$$D_k = a_k|x\rangle\langle x| + b_k|A_1x\rangle\langle x| + c_k|x\rangle\langle xA_k| + d_k|A_1x\rangle\langle xA_k|.$$

A direct computation gives

$$\begin{cases} a_2 = -\langle A_1A_2\rangle, \\ b_2 = \langle A_2\rangle, \\ c_2 = \langle A_1\rangle, \\ d_2 = -1. \end{cases} \tag{A1}$$

For any $k \geq 3$, since $D_k = D_{k-1}[A_k, |x\rangle\langle x|]$, one may take

$$\begin{cases} a_k = a_{k-1}\langle A_k\rangle + c_{k-1}\langle A_{k-1}A_k\rangle, \\ b_k = b_{k-1}\langle A_k\rangle + d_{k-1}\langle A_{k-1}A_k\rangle, \\ c_k = -a_{k-1} - c_{k-1}\langle A_{k-1}\rangle, \\ d_k = -b_{k-1} - d_{k-1}\langle A_{k-1}\rangle. \end{cases} \tag{A2}$$

Take unitors vectors $|y\rangle, |z\rangle$ so that $\{|x\rangle, |y\rangle, |z\rangle\}$ is orthogonal and

$$\begin{cases} |A_1x\rangle = \langle A_1\rangle|x\rangle + \Delta_{A_1}|y\rangle, \\ |A_kx\rangle = \langle A_k\rangle|x\rangle + \beta'|y\rangle + \gamma'|z\rangle. \end{cases}$$

Then

$$\beta' = \Delta_{A_1}^{-1}(\langle A_1A_k\rangle - \langle A_1\rangle\langle A_k\rangle), \quad \Delta_{A_k} = \sqrt{|\beta'|^2 + |\gamma'|^2}. \tag{A3}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} D_k = \; & (a_k + b_k\langle A_1\rangle + c_k\langle A_k\rangle + d_k\langle A_1\rangle\langle A_k\rangle)|x\rangle\langle x| + (c_k + d_k\langle A_1\rangle)\bar{\beta}'|x\rangle\langle y| \\ & +(c_k + d_k\langle A_1\rangle)\bar{\gamma}'|x\rangle\langle z| + (b_k + d_k\langle A_k\rangle)\Delta_{A_1}|y\rangle\langle x| \\ & +d_k\Delta_{A_1}\bar{\beta}'|y\rangle\langle y| + d_k\Delta_{A_1}\bar{\gamma}'|y\rangle\langle z| \\ = \; & f_{11}^{(k)}|x\rangle\langle x| + f_{12}^{(k)}|x\rangle\langle y| + f_{13}^{(k)}|x\rangle\langle z| \\ & +f_{21}^{(k)}|y\rangle\langle x| + f_{22}^{(k)}|y\rangle\langle y| + f_{23}^{(k)}|y\rangle\langle z|. \end{aligned} \tag{A4}$$

Note that, by (A2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_{11}^{(k)} = \; & c_{k-1}(\langle A_{k-1}A_k\rangle - \langle A_{k-1}\rangle\langle A_k\rangle) + d_{k-1}(\langle A_1\rangle\langle A_{k-1}A_k\rangle - \langle A_1\rangle\langle A_{k-1}\rangle\langle A_k\rangle) \\ = \; & -f_{11}^{(k-2)}(\langle A_{k-1}A_k\rangle - \langle A_{k-1}\rangle\langle A_k\rangle) \end{aligned}$$

as

$$\begin{aligned} & c_k + d_k\langle A_1\rangle \\ = \; & -c_{k-2}(\langle A_{k-2}A_{k-1}\rangle - \langle A_{k-2}\rangle\langle A_{k-1}\rangle) - d_{k-2}(\langle A_1\rangle\langle A_{k-2}A_{k-1}\rangle - \langle A_1\rangle\langle A_{k-2}\rangle\langle A_{k-1}\rangle) \\ = \; & -f_{11}^{(k-1)}, \end{aligned}$$

$$d_k = -b_{k-1} - d_{k-1}\langle A_{k-1}\rangle = d_{k-2}(\langle A_{k-2}\rangle\langle A_{k-1}\rangle - \langle A_{k-2}A_{k-1}\rangle)$$

and

$$b_k + d_k\langle A_k\rangle = d_{k-1}(\langle A_{k-1}A_k\rangle - \langle A_{k-1}\rangle\langle A_k\rangle) = -d_{k+1},$$

which reveal that

$$\begin{aligned} & f_{11}^{(k)} = -f_{11}^{(k-2)}(\langle A_{k-1}A_k\rangle - \langle A_{k-1}\rangle\langle A_k\rangle), \\ & f_{12}^{(k)} = -f_{11}^{(k-1)}\bar{\beta}', \\ & f_{13}^{(k)} = -f_{11}^{(k-1)}\bar{\gamma}', \\ & f_{21}^{(k)} = -d_{k+1}\Delta_{A_1} = (\langle A_{k-1}A_k\rangle - \langle A_{k-1}\rangle\langle A_k\rangle)f_{21}^{(k-2)}, \\ & f_{22}^{(k)} = d_k\Delta_{A_1}\bar{\beta}' = (\langle A_{k-2}A_{k-1}\rangle - \langle A_{k-2}\rangle\langle A_{k-1}\rangle)d_{k-2}\Delta_{A_1}\bar{\beta}', \\ & f_{23}^{(k)} = d_k\Delta_{A_1}\bar{\gamma}' = (\langle A_{k-2}A_{k-1}\rangle - \langle A_{k-2}\rangle\langle A_{k-1}\rangle)d_{k-2}\Delta_{A_1}\bar{\gamma}'. \end{aligned} \tag{A5}$$

It is easily checked that

$$D_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \langle A_1\rangle\langle A_2\rangle - \langle A_1A_2\rangle & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\Delta_{A_1}\beta' & -\Delta_{A_1}\gamma' \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \oplus 0$$

and

$$D_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (\langle A_1A_2\rangle - \langle A_1\rangle\langle A_2\rangle)\beta' & (\langle A_1A_2\rangle - \langle A_1\rangle\langle A_2\rangle)\gamma' \\ (\langle A_2\rangle\langle A_3\rangle - \langle A_2A_3\rangle)\Delta_{A_1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \oplus 0$$

if $\dim H \geq 3$;

$$D_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \langle A_1\rangle\langle A_2\rangle - \langle A_1A_2\rangle & 0 \\ 0 & -\Delta_{A_1}\Delta_{A_2} \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$D_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (\langle A_1A_2\rangle - \langle A_1\rangle\langle A_2\rangle)\Delta_{A_2} \\ (\langle A_2\rangle\langle A_3\rangle - \langle A_2A_3\rangle)\Delta_{A_1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

if $\dim H = 2$. Hence, by identify the case of $\dim H = 2$ with the case $\gamma' = 0$, we may agree that D_2 and D_3 have respectively the patten

$$\begin{pmatrix} * & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \oplus 0 \tag{A6}$$

and

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & * & * \\ * & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \oplus 0. \tag{A7}$$

Then Eq.(A5) implies that D_{2n} has the patten (A6) if $k = 2n$ is even and D_{2n+1} has the patten (A7)) if $k = 2n + 1$ is odd.

Let us first calculate $w(D_2)$. It is easily checked that

$$\Delta_{A_1}\Delta_{A_2} \geq w(D_2) = \max\{|\langle A_1A_2\rangle - \langle A_1\rangle\langle A_2\rangle|, \frac{1}{2}|\langle A_1A_2\rangle - \langle A_1\rangle\langle A_2\rangle| + \frac{\Delta_{A_1}\Delta_{A_2}}{2}\}.$$

Thus we have

$$\Delta_{A_1}\Delta_{A_2} \geq |\langle A\rangle\langle B\rangle - \langle AB\rangle| \tag{A8}$$

and

$$w(D_2) = \frac{1}{2}(|\langle A_1A_2\rangle - \langle A_1\rangle\langle A_2\rangle| + \Delta_{A_1}\Delta_{A_2}).$$

If $k = 2n$ is even, then it follows from (A5) that

$$|f_{11}^{(2n)}| = |(\langle A_1A_2\rangle - \langle A_1\rangle\langle A_1\rangle)\cdots(\langle A_{k-1}A_k\rangle - \langle A_{k-1}\rangle\langle A_k\rangle)|. \tag{A9}$$

Since D_{2n} has patten (A6), by (A5) and (A8), we have

$$\|D_{2n}\| = \max\{|f_{11}^{(2n)}|, \sqrt{|f_{22}^{(2n)}|^2 + |f_{23}^{(2n)}|^2}\ \} = |d_{2n}|\Delta_{A_1}\Delta_{A_{2n}}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} w(D_{2n}) = &\ \max\{|f_{11}^{(2n)}|, \tfrac{1}{2}\left(|f_{22}^{(2n)}| + \sqrt{|f_{22}^{(2n)}|^2 + |f_{23}^{(2n)}|^2}\right)\} \\ = &\ \tfrac{1}{2}|d_{2n}|(|\langle A_1A_{2n}\rangle - \langle A_1\rangle\langle A_{2n}\rangle| + \Delta_{A_1}\Delta_{A_{2n}}). \end{aligned}$$

Now $d_2 = -1$ and

$$|d_{2n}| = |d_{2n-2}| \cdot |\langle A_{2n-2}A_{2n-1}\rangle - \langle A_{2n-2}\rangle\langle A_{2n-1}\rangle|$$

entails that

$$w(D_{2n}) = \tfrac{1}{2}(\Pi_{j=1}^{n-1}|\langle A_{2j}A_{2j+1}\rangle - \langle A_{2j}\rangle\langle A_{2j+1}\rangle|)(|\langle A_1A_{2n}\rangle - \langle A_1\rangle\langle A_{2n}\rangle| + \Delta_{A_1}\Delta_{A_{2n}}). \tag{A10}$$

As $\Pi_{j=1}^{2n}\Delta_{A_j} \geq w(D_{2n})$, this completes the proof of (2.4).

If $k = 2n+1$ is odd, then D_{2n+1} has the patten (A7). Applying Lemma A1 gives

$$\begin{aligned} w(D_{2n+1}) = &\ \tfrac{1}{2}\sqrt{(|f_{12}^{(2n+1)}| + |f_{21}^{(2n+1)}|)^2 + |f_{13}^{(2n+1)}|^2} \\ = &\ \tfrac{1}{2}\sqrt{(|f_{11}^{(2n)}\beta'| + |d_{(2n+2)}|\Delta_{A_1})^2 + |f_{11}^{(2n)}\gamma'|^2} \\ = &\ \tfrac{1}{2}\sqrt{(2|f_{11}^{(2n)}d_{(2n+2)}|\Delta_{A_1}\beta'| + |d_{(2n+2)}|^2\Delta_{A_1}^2 + |f_{11}^{(2n)}|^2(|\beta'|^2 + |\gamma'|^2)}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$w(D_{2n+1}) = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{2\pi_1\pi_2|\langle A_1A_{2n+1}\rangle - \langle A_1\rangle\langle A_{2n+1}\rangle| + \pi_2^2\Delta_{A_1}^2 + \pi_1^2\Delta_{A_{2n+1}}^2}, \tag{A11}$$

where

$$\pi_1 = \Pi_{j=1}^{n}|\langle A_{2j-1}A_{2j}\rangle - \langle A_{2j-1}\rangle\langle A_{2j}\rangle|$$

and

$$\pi_2 = \Pi_{j=1}^{n}|\langle A_{2j}A_{2j+1}\rangle - \langle A_{2j}\rangle\langle A_{2j+1}\rangle|.$$

As $\Pi_{j=1}^{2n+1}\Delta_{A_j} \geq w(D_{2n+1})$, we complete the proof of (2.5) by (A11). □

Finally we explain why the sharper inequality

$$\Pi_{j=1}^{k}\Delta_{A_j} \geq \|D_k\| \tag{A12}$$

cannot achieve sharper uncertainty relations than the weaker inequality $\Pi_{j=1}^{k}\Delta_{A_j} \geq w(D_k)$ can.

If $k = 2n$ is even, then by (A5) and (A6) one has

$$\|D_{2n}\| = \Delta_{A_1}\Delta_{A_{2n}}\Pi_{j=1}^{n-1}|\langle A_{2j}A_{2j+1}\rangle - \langle A_{2j}\rangle\langle A_{2j+1}\rangle|.$$

This together with (A12) gives

$$\Pi_{j=2}^{2n-1}\Delta_{A_j} \geq \Pi_{j=1}^{n-1}|\langle A_{2j}A_{2j+1}\rangle - \langle A_{2j}\rangle\langle A_{2j+1}\rangle|,$$

which is weaker than the inequality (2.4).

If $k = 2n + 1$ is odd, then by (A5) and (A7) one has

$$\begin{aligned}\|D_{2n+1}\| = &\ \max\{\sqrt{|f_{12}^{(2n+1)}|^2 + |f_{13}^{(2n+1)}|^2}, |f_{21}^{(2n+1)}|\} \\ = &\ \max\{|f_{11}^{(2n)}|\Delta_{A_{2n+1}}, |d_{2n+2}|\Delta_{A_1}\},\end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\Pi_{j=1}^{2n}\Delta_{A_j} \geq \Pi_{j=1}^{n}|\langle A_{2j-1}A_{2j}\rangle - \langle A_{2j-1}\rangle\langle A_{2j}\rangle|$$

or

$$\Pi_{j=2}^{2n+1}\Delta_{A_j} \geq \Pi_{j=1}^{n}|\langle A_{2j}A_{2j+1}\rangle - \langle A_{2j}\rangle\langle A_{2j+1}\rangle|,$$

again weaker than (2.4).

Acknowledgements This work is partly supported by National Science Foundation of China (11201329, 11171249) and Program for the Outstanding Innovative Teams of Higher Learning Institutions of Shanxi.

Competing interests statement The authors declare that they have no competing financial interests.

Correspondence should be addressed to J. C. Hou (houjinchuan@tyut.edu.cn).

College of Mathematics, Institute of Mathematics, Taiyuan University of Technology, Taiyuan 030024, P. R. China

E-mail address, J.-C. Hou: jinchuanhou@aliyun.com

E-mail address, K. He: hekan@tyut.edu.cn